

ULB-TH 94/19

November 1994

The Semi-Classical Back Reaction to Black Hole Evaporation

S. Massar^{1, 2}

Service de Physique Théorique, Université Libre de Bruxelles,
Campus Plaine, C.P. 225, Bd du Triomphe, B-1050 Brussels, Belgium

Abstract The semi-classical back reaction to black hole evaporation (wherein the renormalized energy momentum tensor is taken as source of Einstein's equations) is analyzed in detail. It is proven that the mass of a Schwarzschild black hole decreases according to Hawking's law $dM/dt = -C/M^2$ where C is a constant of order one and that the particles are emitted with a thermal spectrum at temperature $1/8\pi M(t)$.

¹e-mail: smassar @ ulb.ac.be

²Boursier IISN

On the basis of Hawking's [1] derivation of black hole radiation, wherein matter fields are quantized on the fixed background of a collapsing star, the mass of a black hole is expected to decrease according to the law

$$\frac{dM}{dt} = -\frac{C}{M^2} \quad (1)$$

where C is a constant of order one which takes into account the number and spin of massless fields, the particles emitted at time t being distributed in a thermal spectrum with temperature

$$T_H(t) = \frac{1}{8\pi M(t)} \quad (2)$$

Since Hawking's discovery much interest has focused on the gravitational back reaction in order to confirm or infirm (1) and (2) and hopefully in the process learn something about quantum gravity. One of the simplest schemes in which to investigate the back reaction is the semi-classical theory wherein the renormalized energy momentum tensor is taken as source of Einstein's equations $G_{\mu\nu} = 8\pi\langle T_{\mu\nu}\rangle_{ren}$, ie. the metric remains classical but follows self consistently the mean energy of the field.

In this article we show that (1) and (2) are indeed verified in the semi classical theory of black hole evaporation. However we mention at the outset that due to the exponential Doppler shift experienced by the field in its voyage from inside the star to $\mathcal{I}^+$ the semi classical back reaction is not a consistent approximation to the true back reaction. This is not to say that the predictions of the semi classical theory are necessarily wrong, but the detailed mechanism by which vacuum fluctuations are converted into quanta will necessarily be totally different in a fully quantum theory in which the metric as well as the matter fields fluctuate.

This article is inspired by the work of Hajicek and Israel [2] and Bardeen [3] who showed that the semi classical back reaction is not incompatible with equation (1) and by the work of Parentani and Piran [4] who showed numerically that (1) is verified in a model in which the renormalized energy momentum tensor takes a particularly simple form.

We shall work in Bardeen's coordinates:

$$ds^2 = -e^{2\psi}(1 - 2m/r)dv^2 + 2e^\psi dvdr + r^2 d\Omega^2 \quad (3)$$

In these coordinates Einstein's equations are

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\partial m}{\partial v} &= 4\pi r^2 T_v^r \\ \frac{\partial m}{\partial r} &= -4\pi r^2 T_v^v \\ \frac{\partial \psi}{\partial r} &= 4\pi r T_{rr}\end{aligned}\tag{4}$$

Note that ψ is defined only up to the addition of an arbitrary function of v corresponding to a reparametrization of the v coordinate.

We shall suppose that the right hand side of (4) is given by the renormalized energy momentum tensor (for a review see [5]). The advantage of the coordinate system (3) is that the Hawking flux is encoded near the horizon in a negative energy flux $T_v^r < 0$. Were one to neglect the other components, the solution near the horizon would be a simple Vaidya type metric with only parameter $m(v) = \int^v dv T_{vv}$.

We shall proceed in three steps: first we shall suppose that the renormalized energy momentum tensor resembles the renormalized energy momentum tensor in the absence of back reaction. We shall then show that under this hypothesis the metric coefficients in (3) are slowly varying functions of r and v . Finally we shall solve adiabatically the Klein Gordon equation in this slowly varying metric and show that the renormalized energy momentum tensor indeed possesses the properties supposed at the outset thereby proving that the calculation is consistent.

Our first task is to obtain estimates for $T_{\mu\nu}$ both far and near the black hole. We begin with the former. We suppose that when r is equal to a few times $2m$ (say $r = O(6m)$) there is only an outgoing flux $T_{uu}(r \gg 2m) = L_H(u)/4\pi r^2$ where L_H is the luminosity of the black hole. This is justified since in the absence of back reaction the other components of $T_{\mu\nu}$ decrease as large inverse powers of r , for instance the trace anomaly decreases as m^2/r^6 . We shall also suppose that L_H is small and varies slowly. Hence when $r > O(6m)$ an outgoing Vaidya metric is an exact solution of Einstein's equations

$$\begin{aligned}ds^2 &= -(1 - \frac{2m(u)}{r})du^2 - 2dudr + r^2 d\omega^2 \\ m(u) &= \int^u du L_H(u)\end{aligned}\tag{5}$$

The change of coordinates from (4) to (5) is obtained by writing the equation for infalling radial null geodesics in the metric (5) as

$$Fdv = du + \frac{2dr}{1 - 2m(u)/r} \quad (6)$$

where F is an integration factor. Upon using (6) to change coordinates from the set (u, r) to (v, r) one finds that $e^\psi = F$ and $m(r, v) = m(u)$. Hence when $r > O(6m)$ the r.h.s. of (4) is given by

$$\begin{aligned} 4\pi r^2 T_v^r(r > O(6m)) &= -e^\psi L_H \\ -4\pi r^2 T_v^v(r > O(6m)) &= 2L_H/(1 - 2m/r) \\ 4\pi r T_{rr}(r > O(6m)) &= 4L_H/r(1 - 2m/r)^2 \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

We now estimate $T_{\mu\nu}$ near the horizon by assuming that the energy momentum tensor measured by an inertial observer falling across the horizon is finite and of order L_H . The jacobian relating v, r to $(\alpha), (\beta)$ the orthonormal frame of a free falling observer is $e_{(0)}^\mu = (e^{-\psi}(\Gamma - \dot{r})^{-1}, \dot{r}, 0, 0)$, $e_{(1)}^\mu = (e^{-\psi}(\Gamma - \dot{r})^{-1}, \Gamma, 0, 0)$ where $\Gamma = (1 - \frac{2m}{r} + \dot{r}^2)^{1/2}$ and $\dot{r}$ is the rate of change of radius per unit proper time of the observer. If $\dot{r} \simeq -1$ near $r = 2m$, the tetrad components are regular because Γ does not vanish. Assuming $T^{(\alpha)(\beta)} = O(L_H/r^2)$ yields $r^2 T_v^r(r \simeq 2m) = O(e^\psi L_H)$, $r^2 T_v^v(r \simeq 2m) = O(L_H)$, $r T_{rr}(r \simeq 2m) = O(L_H/2m)$. The conservation of energy is

$$(r^2 T_v^r)_{,r} + r^2 T_{v,v}^v = 0 \quad (8)$$

where $r^2 T_{v,v}^v = O(L_{H,v})$. Integrating the conservation equation from $r = 2m$ to $r = O(6m)$ yields T_v^r near the horizon in terms of its value where (7) is valid. Putting everything together, near the horizon we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial m}{\partial v} &= -L_H e^\psi + O(m L_{H,v}) \\ \frac{\partial m}{\partial r} &= O(L_H) \\ \frac{\partial \psi}{\partial 2m} &= O(L_H/r) \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

As announced all metric coefficients vary slowly if L_H is small and varies slowly. Integrating the equation for ψ yields $e^\psi \simeq r^{L_H}$ for all $r \geq 2m$. Hence

ψ can safely be neglected up to distances $r = O(e^{1/L_H})$. From now on we suppose for simplicity of the algebra that $\psi = 0$.

Before proceeding we first discuss the location of the horizons in the geometry (3) with $\psi = 0$. The apparent horizon is the locus where outgoing geodesics obey $dr/dv = 0$, therefore solution of

$$r_a(v) = 2m(v, r_a(v)) \quad (10)$$

One may, following Bardeen, define the mass of the black hole at time v from $M(v) = r_a(v)/2$ whereupon (9) and (10) give

$$\frac{dM}{dv} = -L_H + O(L_H^2) + O(ML_{H,v}) \quad (11)$$

Hence equation (1) is recovered provided one proves $L_H = C/M^2$ and one takes v as time parameter.

We also record here the equation for the event horizon $r_H(v)$. This is the last light ray which reaches $\mathcal{I}^+$. It satisfies the equation of outgoing nul geodesics

$$\frac{dr_H}{dv} = \frac{1}{2} \frac{r_H - 2m(r_H, v)}{r_H} \quad (12)$$

We obtain an asymptotic expansion for $r_H(v)$ by requiring that it remains at a finite distance from $r = 2M$ for all v , ie. neither diverges to $r = \infty$ nor falls into the singularity at $r = 0$. Setting $r_H(v) = 2M(v) + \Delta(v)$ we rewrite (12) in the form $\Delta = 2(2M + \Delta)(2M_{,v} + \Delta_{,v}) + 2(m(v, M + \Delta) - M)$. Solving recursively one obtains a series for Δ the first term of which is $\Delta = 8MM_{,v}$. If one supposes $L_H = C/M^2$ one finds that $\Delta = -8C/M$.

In order to calculate the modes or $\langle T_{\mu\nu} \rangle$ we must first investigate the outgoing radial nul geodesics in the metric (3) with $\psi = 0$. It is convenient to change variables to the set $(v, x = r - r_H(v))$ ie. x is the distance from the event horizon. In these coordinates the metric becomes (using (12))

$$ds^2 = \frac{2m(v, r_H + x)x}{r_H(r_H + x)} dv^2 - 2dvdx - r^2 d\Omega^2 \quad (13)$$

When $x \ll r_H$ the equation for radial outgoing nul geodesics can be solved exactly to yield an exponential approach to the horizon of the form $\tilde{v} - 2 \ln x = f(v)$ where

$$\tilde{v} = \int^v dv \frac{2m(v, r_H(v))}{r_H^2(v)} \quad (14)$$

This motivates the following ansatz for the outgoing radial null geodesics

$$\tilde{v} - 2\frac{x}{r_H(v)} - 2\ln x + \delta = \frac{u}{2\tilde{m}(u)} + D \quad (15)$$

with D a constant of integration. This should be compared with the solution in the absence of backreaction $v - 2r - 4M \ln(r - 2M) = u$. The function of u on the r.h.s. of (15) has been written as $u/\tilde{m}(u)$ for dimensional reasons. The quantity δ is of order $O(L_H(Mx + x^2)/M^2)$ for all x (this is shown by substitution of (15) into the equation for radial nul geodesics and integrating the equation for δ along the geodesics $u = \text{const}$). The function $\tilde{m}(u)$ is determined by requiring that the variable u in equation (15) be the same as in the Vaidya metric equation (5). The difference $m(u) - \tilde{m}(u)$ is of order $O(ML_H)$. This is found by using (15) to change coordinates from the set (v, r) to the set (u, r) at the radius $r = O(6M)$ where (5) is valid.

Equation (15) is sufficient to prove the first of our hypothesis, to wit that the flux emitted is $O(M^{-2})$. Indeed, neglecting the potential barrier and taking only s-waves into account (as in the model of Parentani and Piran), the flux emitted is given by [6]: $T_{uu}/4\pi r^2 = (1/12\pi)(d\mathcal{U}/du)^{1/2}(d/du)^2(d\mathcal{U}/du)^{-1/2}$ where $\mathcal{U}$ labels the outgoing geodesics as measured by an inertial observer inside the star (it is analogous to the Kruskal coordinate U). The jacobian $du/d\mathcal{U}$ is calculated by remarking that at the surface of the star the derivative at fixed v $d\mathcal{U}/dr|_{v=vstar} = -2$ is constant. Hence $du/d\mathcal{U} = -(1/2)du/dr|_{v=vstar} = (1/2)4\tilde{m}(u)/x|_{v=vstar} = -4\tilde{m}(u)/\mathcal{U}$. In this expression we have neglected transients which occur when the star has just collapsed (these transients vanish as $e^{-\Delta u/4m}$ where Δu is the time since the star began collapsing). Hence the flux at times $\Delta u > O(4m)$ is equal to $(\pi/12)T_H^2(u)$ where $T_H(u) = 1/8\pi\tilde{m}(u) = 1/8\pi m(u)(1 + O(L_H))$ as announced. (We mention that there is an intimate relation between the thermal flux T_{uu} just calculated and the thermal distribution of the emitted photons. Indeed in the saddle point evaluation of Bogoljubov coefficients [7] the jacobian $du/d\mathcal{U} = -4\tilde{m}(u)/\mathcal{U}$ is the necessary ingredient to prove that the high energy photons are distributed Boltzmanly at temperature $T_H(u)$.)

We now return to the second hypothesis and check that $T_{\mu\nu}$ is regular near the horizon. To this end one writes the Klein Gordon equation in the coordinates (13) and notes that modes of the form $\varphi_{\lambda,l,m} = r^{-1}Y_l^m e^{-i\lambda\tilde{v}}|x|^{2i\lambda}\theta(\pm x)$ are solutions near the horizon $|x| \ll M$. The condition of positive frequency inside the star is described succinctly (see [8] and [9]) by asking that one may

continue x analytically in the upper half complex plane. This fixes the ratio of the $\theta(\pm x)$ pieces to be $e^{-2\pi\lambda}$, hence the thermal character of the flux. When calculating Green's functions or derivatives thereof at the coincidence point one rescales λ to $\lambda \rightarrow \omega = \lambda 2m(v, r_H)/r_H^2$ to obtain the same mode sum in the ultraviolet as in the absence of back reaction. Therefore the renormalized energy momentum tensor is regular near the horizon. This is sufficient for our purpose and proves that our scheme is consistent.

One may however go beyond this qualitative discussion and make a quantitative estimate of $T_{\mu\nu}$ by using the following adiabatic expansion of the modes. One writes the solution of the Klein Gordon equation in the absence of back reaction as $\varphi_{\omega,l,m}^0 = r^{-1}Y_l^m e^{-i\omega v} |r-2M|^{4iM\omega} f(4M\omega, l, (r-2M)/2M)$. Then one makes the ansatz for the solution in the metric equation (13) $\varphi_{\lambda,l,m} = r^{-1}Y_l^m e^{-i\lambda\tilde{v}} |x|^{i\lambda} f(2\lambda, l, x/r_H(v))(1 + \chi(x, v))$. Calculation shows that χ is proportional to L_H and encodes effects such as a change of $O(L_H)$ in the potential barrier in the wave equation and a little frequency mixing in the potential barrier due to the time dependence of $m(r, v)$. It gives rise to a modification of the energy momentum tensor which compared to the estimates in the absence of back reaction are $\delta T_{\mu\nu}/T_{\mu\nu} = O(L_H)$. The validity of this adiabatic expansion up to distances $r = O(6M)$ where the waves propagate as purely outgoing modes proves that all the emitted quanta, and not only the Boltzman ones, are distributed thermally with temperature $T_H(u) = 1/8\pi\tilde{m}(u)$.

In addition to the Hawking temperature T_H being slightly different from $1/8\pi m(u)$ there is also a slight athermicity due to the variation of the temperature over time. However none of these effects encode information about the quantum state of the star. In this respect the semi classical back reaction resembles the usual Hawking calculation in that one is confronted with a violation of unitarity for the outside observer[10].

We conclude with some remarks concerning the validity of the semi classical back reaction used so far. In the preceding calculation we have made appeal to the geometry and the structure of the quantum field on scales exponentially smaller than the Planck scale. This is manifestly absurd [11]. We now investigate where in space time and at what scale will quantum back reaction effects completely modify the semi-classical back reaction. To this end we consider the fluctuations of $T_{\mu\nu}$ and in particular the energy momentum correlated to the presence (or absence) of a specific Hawking photon at $\mathcal{I}^+$. We recall here the main properties derived in [12] of the energy momentum

correlated to the presence of a particular particle (denoted i_0) at $\mathcal{I}^+$ in a wave packet centered around u_0 , with energy $\simeq \omega_0 = O(M^{-1}) : 1$) it is given by the conserved tensor $T_{uu}^{i_0} = (1/4\pi r^2)f^{i_0}(u)$; 2) $\int du f^{i_0}(u) = \omega_0$; 3) $f^{i_0}(u)$ takes its values in a region of width ω_0^{-1} around u_0 ; 4) In addition to the piece of $T_{uu}^{i_0}$ just described in the outside region $r > r_H$, there is a piece (the partner) on the other side of the horizon $r < r_H$; 5) Inside the star $T_{\mu\nu}^{i_0}$ takes the form $(1/4\pi r^2)f^{i_0}(u)$ after reflecting at $r = 0$ whereas before reflection it is the form $T_{vv}^{i_0} = (1/4\pi r^2)f^{i_0}(v)$.

To get a taste for back reaction effects we shall take $T_{\mu\nu}^{i_0}$ as the source for Einstein's equations. This will give us a qualitative estimate of when back reaction effects become important. We first consider the interior of the star. There one should express distances and energies in terms of the inertial coordinate $\mathcal{U}$ rather than u , hence reexpress $T_{uu}^{i_0}$ as $T_{\mathcal{U}\mathcal{U}}^{i_0} = T_{uu}^{i_0}(du/d\mathcal{U})^2 = T_{uu}^{i_0}(2\tilde{m}(u_0)/x|_{v=vstar})^2$. The energy density $(1/4\pi r^2)T_{\mathcal{U}\mathcal{U}}^{i_0}$ reaches the Planck scale when $r = O(1)$ and $x|_{v=vstar} \simeq m(u_0)e^{-u_0/4\tilde{m}(u_0)} = O(1)$ and the quantum field can then no longer be approximated as free in the center of the star. It is important to notice that the time necessary to reach this Planckian regime is $\Delta u = O(m \ln m)$ which should be compared with the total evaporation time $\Delta u = O(m^3)$. However this central region can perhaps be treated in a phenomenological way and could be irrelevant inasmuch as Hawking radiation is considered. Hence we now consider the fluctuations of the geometry induced by the fluctuations of $T_{\mu\nu}$ near the horizon. Then integration of equations (4) shows that the effect of the fluctuation $T_{uu}^{i_0} = (1/4\pi r^2)f^{i_0}(u)$ induces a change in the mass parameter $m \rightarrow m + O(\omega_0)$ in passing from $u = u_0 - O(\omega_0^{-1})$ to $u = u_0 + O(\omega_0^{-1})$. However going backwards in time the photon i_0 gets exponentially close to the horizon r_H (since the light rays (15) adhere exponentially to the horizon). It is very soon at a distance $r - r_H = O(M^{-1})$, i.e. inside the domain where the horizon is shifting due to the presence of particle i_0 itself. Hence the geometric concepts of apparent horizon, event horizon, outgoing light rays breaks down into a quantum soup (the quantum ergosphere of York [14]) of width $r - r_H = O(M^{-1})$. In this region a free field approximation is certainly not valid. How the quantum theory of gravity contrives to build up (or maybe not to build up) Hawking radiation out of the soup is the subject of much conjecture.

Acknowledgements. The author would like to thank R. Brout, F. Englert, R. Parentani and Ph. Spindel for helpful discussions and R. Brout for a

careful rereading of the manuscript.

References

- [1] S.W. Hawking, Nature **248** (1974) 30, Commun. Math. Phys., 43 (1975) 199
- [2] P. Hajicek and W. Israel, Phys. Lett. A **80** (1980) 1
- [3] J. Bardeen, Phys. Rev. Lett. **46** (1981) 382
- [4] R. Parentani and T. Piran *The Internal Geometry of an Evaporating Black Hole* hep-th/9405007
- [5] N. D. Birrel and P. C. W. Davies, *Quantum Fields in Curved Space* Cambridge University Press, Cambridge (1982)
- [6] P. C. W. Davies, S. Fulling and W.G. Unruh, Phys. Rev. D **13** (1976) 2720
- [7] R. Parentani and R. Brout, Int. J. Mod. Phys. D **1** (1992) 169.
- [8] T. Damour and R. Ruffini , Phys. Rev. D **14** (1976) 332.
- [9] W. G. Unruh, Phys. Rev. D **14** (1976) 870.
- [10] S. H. Hawking, Phys. Rev. D **14** (1976) 2460.
- [11] T. Jacobson, Phys. Rev. D **44** (1991) 1731, D **48** (1993) 728.
- [12] F. Englert, S. Massar and R. Parentani *Source Vacuum Fluctuations of Black Hole Radiance*, preprint ULB-TH 94/03, gr-qc/9404026, to be published in Class. Quantum Grav.
S. Massar and R. Parentani *From Vacuum Fluctuations to Radiation: Accelerated Detectors and Black Holes*, preprint ULB-TH 94/02, gr-qc/9404057
- [13] Y. Aharonov, D. Albert, A. Casher, and L. Vaidman, Phys. Lett. A **124** 199 (1987),
Y. Aharonov, L. Vaidman , Phys. Rev. A **41** 11 (1990),

Y. Aharonov, J. Anandan, S. Popescu, and L. Vaidman, Phys. Rev. Lett. **64**, 2965 (1990)

[14] J. W. York, Phys. Rev. D **28** (1983) 2929